

ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

DATE: February 6, 2007

CALLED TO ORDER: 5:08 p.m.

ADJOURNED: 6:30 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

Attending Members

Joanne Sanders, Chair
Paul Bateman
Vernon Brown
Jackie Nytes
Lincoln Plowman

Absent Members

Becky Langsford
Lynn McWhirter

AGENDA

PROPOSAL NO. 8, 2007 - reappoints Sheriff Frank Anderson to the Information Technology Board

“Do Pass”

Vote 4-0

PROPOSAL NO. 11, 2007 - reappoints Marion County Treasurer Michael Rodman to the Information Technology Board

“Do Pass”

Vote 4-0

PROPOSAL NO. 15, 2007 - reappoints Councillor Marilyn Pfisterer to the City-County Internal Audit Committee

“Postponed” until February 20, 2007

Vote 4-0

PROPOSAL NO. 57, 2007 - appoints Gregory H. Coleman to the Indianapolis Marion County Building Authority Board of Trustees

“Postponed” until February 20, 2007

Vote 4-0

PROPOSAL NO. 58, 2007 - appoints Robert Lutz to the Equal Opportunity Advisory Board

“Postponed” until February 20, 2007

Vote 4-0

PROPOSAL NO. 59, 2007 - determines the need to lease approximately 50,000 square feet of space at 151 North Delaware for use by the Marion County Public Defender Agency

“Do Pass”

Vote 5-0

Administration and Finance Committee

February 6, 2007

Page 3

PROPOSAL NO. 90, 2007 - approves the Installment Tax Payment Plan for certain real estate taxes

“Do Pass”

Vote 5-0

Information on the distribution of raises for the civilian employees of the City of Indianapolis –
Bob Clifford, City Controller

ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Administration and Finance Committee of the City-County Council met on Tuesday, February 7, 2007. Chair Joanne Sanders called the meeting to order at 5:08 p.m. with the following members present: Vernon Brown, Jackie Nytes, and Lincoln Plowman. Paul Bateman arrived shortly thereafter. Absent were Becky Langsford and Lynn McWhirter.

PROPOSAL NO. 8, 2007 - reappoints Sheriff Frank Anderson to the Information Technology Board

Sheriff Anderson said that he believes that with the consolidation, his department possibly has the largest usage of Information Technology (IT) in the City and the County. He said that it is important that the best service is available and that users are familiar with the processes, which is why he feels that it is essential that he or his proxy are involved with the IT Board. He said that he chose his proxy, Ron Meadows, Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department (IMPD), because Mr. Meadows is very knowledgeable, has been trained, and has educational background in IT.

Chair Sanders said that the ordinance states that, among other elected officials, the Sheriff is to be one of the appointments to the IT Board. She stated that according to the attendance record, the Sheriff has been represented at 12 out of 13 meetings. Sheriff Anderson said that he apologizes for the missed attendance at the last meeting, as the absence was due to a communication problem.

Councillor Brown asked Sheriff Anderson if Mr. Meadows is a sworn officer. Sheriff Anderson answered that Mr. Meadows was a sworn officer, but is now a civilian employee.

Councillor Nytes moved, seconded by Councillor Brown, to forward Proposal No. 8, 2007 to the full Council with a "Do Pass" recommendation. The motion carried by a vote of 4-0. .

Mr. Meadows commented that he appreciates the Council's support. He said that he communicates with the Sheriff on a regular basis regarding the IT Board's meetings, as he has served as the proxy for the last five Sheriffs. He said that there is a lot to do, and he believes that the IT Board is headed in the right direction for doing business differently than in the past. Working with Northrup Gruman has resulted in great strides; however, there are additional items that can be done to improve services and reduce expenses.

PROPOSAL NO. 11, 2007 - reappoints Marion County Treasurer Michael Rodman to the Information Technology Board

Mr. Rodman said that he has some IT background in his previous banking career, as the whole banking industry depends on computers and software, as well as the many changes that are included. He said though public service is different, the Treasurer's Office cannot function without good computers and software. He said that he has learned a lot from the other members of the IT Board, and they have tried to set a goal of having the best IT service that can be obtained. Mr. Rodman said that he is looking forward to a new property system this year after

JUSTIS is completed for the Public Safety area. He said that a new property system is needed to help the Treasurer's Office, as well as many other agencies, such as Public Safety.

Councillor Nytes said that she believes that the new property system is critical to the City's ability to make necessary adjustments and share information. She asked if Mr. Rodman can keep a high level of communication with the Council as the new property system project progresses. Mr. Rodman answered that the Treasurer's Office would gladly keep the Council informed.

Chair Sanders said that the attendance records indicate that Mr. Rodman or his proxy, Chief Deputy Treasurer Thomas Creasser, have attended over 90% of the meetings. She said that Mr. Rodman has personally attended over two-thirds. Mr. Rodman stated that he was not aware of any missed meetings. Shital Patel, Chief Financial Officer, Information Services Officer (ISA), stated that Mr. Rodman was not appointed until after the second meeting.

Councillor Nytes moved, seconded by Councillor Brown, to forward Proposal No. 11, 2007 to the full Council with a "Do Pass" recommendation. The motion carried by a vote of 4-0.

PROPOSAL NO. 15, 2007 - reappoints Councillor Marilyn Pfisterer to the City-County Internal Audit Committee

Chair Sanders stated that Councillor Pfisterer is out of town, and consequently, cannot attend the meeting.

Councillor Brown asked, since this is a reappointment, if the Committee could move forward with this proposal. Chair Sanders answered that other reappointments have not been treated in the same manner; therefore, she would prefer to maintain consistency and postpone the proposal until the next meeting. Chair Sanders said that Councillor Pfisterer is at a training session in another city.

Councillor Nytes moved, seconded by Councillor Brown, to "Postpone" Proposal No. 15, 2007 until February 20, 2007. The motion carried by a vote of 4-0.

PROPOSAL NO. 57, 2007 - appoints Gregory H. Coleman to the Indianapolis Marion County Building Authority Board of Trustees

Chair Sanders stated that Mr. Coleman is out of town and unable to attend the meeting.

Councillor Nytes moved, seconded by Councillor Brown, to "Postpone" Proposal No. 57, 2007 until February 20, 2007. The motion carried by a vote of 4-0.

PROPOSAL NO. 58, 2007 - appoints Robert Lutz to the Equal Opportunity Advisory Board

Chair Sanders said that Mr. Lutz is unable to attend the meeting due to the weather, as he was on the other side of town.

Councillor Nytes moved, seconded by Councillor Brown, to “Postpone” Proposal No. 58, 2007 until February 20, 2007. The motion carried by a vote of 4-0.

[Clerk’s note: Councillor Bateman arrived at this time, 5:25 p.m.]

PROPOSAL NO. 59, 2007 - determines the need to lease approximately 50,000 square feet of space at 151 North Delaware for use by the Marion County Public Defender Agency

David Cook, Marion County Public Defender, stated that Proposal No. 59, 2007 deals with the need for the Marion County Public Defender’s Agency (MCPDA) to have additional space to accommodate existing and new staff created by the Executive Committee’s note in 2006, as well as budgeting for additional courts and other needs in 2007. Mr. Cook distributed a fact sheet about the Public Defender’s Agency (attached as Exhibit A) that included the following highlights:

- Brief History
 - MCPDA was created in 1994, and in 1995 there were approximately 30 Full-Time employees

Chair Sanders asked Mr. Cook to explain the existence of the Office of the Public Defender prior to 1994. Mr. Cook said that prior to 1993, Public Defenders were out-of-court services and were appointments and employees of the individual judges of the Superior Courts. He said that there wasn’t any type of support for things such as costs of litigation; the only thing that appeared in court services were the salaries attributed to having Public Defenders. There were ethical concerns with the Public Defender’s position as an employee of the Judge and there was no organized approach to providing appropriate funding for the service. Chair Sanders asked if the funding in the courts budget transferred with the inception of the Public Defender Agency. Mr. Cook answered that he is unsure, as he was not the first Chief Public Defender. He said, however, that particular funding only provided for part-time, contract lawyer salaries. Mr. Cook said that when he took over the agency, the funding was approximately \$3 to \$4 million. Chair Sanders stated that she was not suggesting that it was enough to make the transfer. She was simply inquiring as to whether the funding became a portion of the budget.

- Brief History (continued)
 - 2007 Full-Time Equivalency is 218.87
 - Over the last ten years movement toward having full-time representation, along with a contingent of part-time lawyers providing indigent services, has been the goal.
 - Juvenile Division will remain at the 46th Street location
- Present Locations Effected by Proposed Move
 - City-County Building (CCB)
 - 5th Floor – 10,550 square feet (sq. ft.)
 - 11th Floor – 1,198 sq. ft.
 - 12th Floor – 6,278 sq. ft.
 - Total 26, 786 sq. ft.

- In 1995, MCPDA was originally allotted space to provide services for indigent legal services on the 12th Floor
 - Judge Payne also provided three or four offices at the Juvenile Division in 1995
 - In 2000, MCPDA expanded to the 5th Floor after the Prosecutor's Office moved to the Market Square Building
- 1219 East Market Street
 - 7th Floor – additional 4,380 sq. ft.
 - Lease in effect until 2009
 - Currently accommodates 25 or 28 individuals
- Reasons for additional space
 - Most attorneys do not have private offices
 - Two-to-three attorneys in single office
 - As many as four paralegals in one office space
 - Executive Committee's note created additional staff in 2006
 - 2007 Budget approved additional staff in 2007
 - Communications with City Controller, Bob Clifford, regarding the possibility of additional space for 2007
 - No room for additional staff – CCB unable to accommodate needs
 - MCPDA volunteered to leave CCB if appropriate space found
 - Mr. Clifford took on responsibility of finding additional space for MCPDA
 - Determined that MCPDA would be best suited by moving out of the CCB to obtain additional space
 - Mr. Clifford requested that Paul Smith, Real Estate Manager, Department of Parks and Recreation, help find outside space in the downtown area for MCPDA
 - Space calculated to meet present needs – 50,000 sq. ft.
 - Approximately 200 individuals will be involved in the move.
 - Negotiations began with the Gold Building and the Disciples of Christ building
 - Mr. Smith was involved in the meetings with both groups and he recommends the Gold Building as the most economical in meeting the needs of MCPDA.

Chair Sanders asked if there will be a lease broken at the 129 East Market Street location. Mr. Cook answered in the affirmative, and stated that the lease has a one-year escape clause. He said that with approval, the move is not expected to take effect until possibly July or August; therefore, the buy-out on the balance of that lease will be considerably lessened.

Chair Sanders asked if the move is approved, would it result in approximately 26,000 sq. ft. of space becoming available in the CCB. She asked if there is a commitment to Building Authority relative to the space and how it would be charged off in relation to the budget. Mr. Clifford answered that the space will most likely be absorbed by the courts or court functions and a space allocation committee will be reformed to determine how the space will be distributed between

agencies. He said that he has toured the building with Mr. Smith and Ron Reinking, Building Authority General Manager, and he has noticed that some of the agencies are overcrowded and a number of floors have people with less than 100 sq. ft. per person, including hallways and conference rooms. Mr. Clifford said that efficiencies are also being examined as to whether some floors can be segregated for specific departments, which may cause some people to move office locations. He said that minimal elevator usage could result in more convenience for clients. Mr. Clifford said that Mr. Smith will look into all aspects, as he was previously the Real Estate and Space Manager for the entire city until that position was eliminated.

Mr. Smith said that he has taken on this position, as he does not believe that there is not enough work to employ a full-time person or a brokerage firm for this particular project. He said that he appreciates the confidence that Mr. Clifford has shown in him. Chair Sanders said that the Council appreciates that Mr. Smith is able to give a holistic view of how people are housed in the CCB and the creation of more efficiencies can be beneficial to everyone.

Councillor Nytes said that she is pleased to hear that the Space Allocation Committee will be reconstituted, as it was a good way to ensure communication between agencies and the Council. Councillor Nytes asked Mr. Cook if the MCPDA also employs contract employees. Mr. Cook answered in the affirmative. Councillor Nytes asked if office or conference space is provided for those attorneys. Mr. Cook answered that, when the space was available, a basic office including a desk, computer, and telephone, was made available to those contract attorneys when they needed to perform public defender business in the building. Councillor Nytes asked if the move would allow for that type of space to be made available again. Mr. Cook answered in the affirmative.

Councillor Nytes asked if the tenant build-out will be included in the lease for the new MCPDA arrangement. Mr. Smith answered in the affirmative. He said that is standard. The building owner can issue what amounts to be a “street price” for the space in its current condition, including their profit. A lessee asks for a build-out and will be amortized over a ten-year period of time, as it is a ten-year lease. Mr. Cook said that he got an idea from Bingham McHale about an interesting office concept of “Universal Office Space”, which is where everyone’s office space is exactly the same, and is expecting to employ that concept in the Gold Building. He said by using this concept, the space has been very efficiently laid out. Mr. Smith said that with MCPDA’s agreement to move out, it provides an opportunity to reconstitute the group.

Councillor Nytes asked if anyone involved in the project from the city side has interest in the building or property. Mr. Smith answered in the negative.

Councillor Sanders asked if the build-out and lease include all of the office furnishings. Mr. Cook answered in the negative and stated that, with the approval of the Controller, necessary office furniture has been bought from auctions at very minimal prices. The furniture was previously stored at the old Central State, but has been moved with minimal damage.

Mr. Clifford said that this has been a long process because he wanted to ensure that a good economic deal was being obtained. He said that the Gold Building is not the least expensive per sq. ft., but was more efficient in many respects.

Councillor Brown asked approximately how much the lease will cost the City per year, as a lot of office space is leased as opposed to purchasing land or buying a building. He said that last year there was a proposal to purchase the Ludlow Building, which highlighted the benefits of buying versus leasing, and he believes that the City should look into purchasing land to house all the courts, the Prosecutor's Office, and the Public Defender's Office in one building rather than continuing to lease property throughout downtown Indianapolis. Mr. Clifford said that it would actually cost the City more to build than what the City will pay to lease per sq. ft. Mr. Smith said that the lease for the Gold Building will cost the MCPDA \$720,000 in the first year, which includes the build-out.

Councillor Brown asked what the Prosecutor's Office pays for their lease. Mr. Clifford said that he believes that the Prosecutor's Office pays \$1.2 million per year.

Councillor Brown asked if the MCPDA lease will go up every year. Mr. Smith answered in the affirmative, and stated that it will increase approximately 2.5% increase per year and it is standard in most leases in the downtown area. Councillor Brown asked how much it will cost to build a new government center. Mr. Clifford answered that it will be approximately \$200 million to \$300 million. Councillor Brown said that he would rather the City own the property than rent it, as it would be a long-term aid to the City and the benefit of the taxpayers. Mr. Cook said that one of the issues is immediate need and the system's ability to respond and provide the necessary space to perform services. Councillor Brown asked if ten years is the standard lease. Mr. Smith answered that commercial leasing is typically never less than five years, and ten years can be relatively short. He said that moving the MCPDA will allow the City to address other interim needs for space within the building. Councillor Brown said that he understands the immediate need.

Mr. Clifford said that there is office space that is unabsorbed that is over and above what the City pays to occupy the CCB. He said that lease, including parking, averages to be approximately \$10 per sq. ft., whereas the lease for the Gold Building will average at approximately \$16 per sq. ft. Mr. Smith said that in comparing the numbers, it also must be recognized that there are currently three people to a room, which does not reflect good working square footage.

Councillor Nytes said that the Councillors received a copy of a letter expressing that the Public Defenders are at risk of losing a state reimbursement, and asked if it relates to this proposal to relocate. Mr. Cook said that the letter is relevant to a case-load issue, but more people could not be hired to address the case-load issue because there is no space to employ them. Councillor Nytes asked if this problem is another example of the need to relocate, as it can result in the loss of a significant state reimbursement. Mr. Cook answered in the affirmative, and stated that he and Mr. Clifford are addressing the case-load issue. Councillor Nytes asked if Mr. Cook expects the state to consider the approval of this lease as an action in good faith. Mr. Cook answered that

it is possible, but the State's concern is case-loads per lawyer and due to the inability to provide space for approved additional lawyers, MCPDA has not been able to address that concern.

Councillor Nytes moved, seconded by Councillor Bateman, to forward Proposal No. 59, 2007 to the full Council with a "Do Pass" recommendation. The motion carried by a vote of 5-0.

PROPOSAL NO. 90, 2007 - approves the Installment Tax Payment Plan for certain real estate taxes

Mr. Rodman distributed a copy of letter that he sent to units of government, along with a timeline (attached as Exhibit B) and he informed the Committee that the Treasurer's Office will not be able to make a May 10 deadline for property taxes because only six of nine Township Assessors have been able to turn in their assessed values to the County Assessor. He said that five of the six appear to be in good form, and the sixth just arrived this morning so he does not yet have feedback on it. He said that the remaining three have missed a deadline that was set earlier this year. He said that the Treasurer's Office cannot print the bills until the State has approved and returned all the information. Mr. Rodman said, according to the timeline, if everything was completed by February 5, which it was not, the bills would have been due June 22 or June 29. This is a significant delay from May 10, and will impact cash flow resulting in units of government borrowing money and reducing the amount of interest that the City was hoping to earn this year.

Chair Sanders asked if the City will also have to pay more interest on the current loans. Mr. Rodman answered in the affirmative. Mr. Rodman said that he received e-mails from two township assessors inquiring as to whether the Tax Management Associates (TMA) auditing service on for the May collection. He said that he is waiting for direction from the Council and legal counsel as to how TMA will be handled. Mr. Rodman said that TMA was hired by the township assessors to help perform audits on personal property and inventory that was supposed to deliver 75% of the tax dollar to taxpayers and the firm would receive 25%. This has not been the case, the taxpayers are actually receiving 40% and the firm is receiving 60%. Chair Sanders said that the contract was instituted in 2004 by previous assessors and the Council, as the fiscal body of the County, was not given information about the contract until it was in effect. Mr. Rodman said that legal counsel is inquiring as to how the contract can be broken or some type of relief can be given.

Chair Sanders said that a representative from the Department of Local Government Finance (DLGF) was expected to attend the meeting tonight, but he unfortunately was unable to attend. She said that the Committee will work to have someone from DLGF appear before the Committee to discuss the City's position with regard to the assessors submitting their assessed values to determine the county-wide impact. Chair Sanders said that she is regretful that there is no means of consequence for the assessors' withholding of necessary information, but there are penalties for taxpayers who do not pay their taxes on time.

Mr. Creasser said that state statute provides the opportunity for the County Treasurer to request consideration for an installment tax plan to be done annually. He said that this proposal is to

satisfy the annual request for approval to provide an installment tax payment program for specified residents in Marion County. He distributed a handout (attached as Exhibit C) that provides information on the participants of the 2005 pay 2006 Installment Tax Payment Program. Mr. Creasser discussed the information including the following key points:

- 213 total participants with property taxes totaling \$308,926.55
- Program benefits taxpayers by allowing them to divide their payments into equal monthly payments as opposed to twice annual payments
- Program basically addresses limited and fixed incomes
- Program must be done manually versus using the property system
- Exhibit C lists four prerequisites for participation and a list of additional circumstances that a taxpayer must meet at least one of to qualify for the program
- The Treasurer's Office can be notified at 327-4040 if interested

Councillor Sanders asked if there is a deadline by which taxpayers must apply. Cindy Land, Administrative Deputy Treasurer, stated that taxpayers are required to file before the first payment is due. She said that taxpayers are asked to pay an estimated amount until the actual bill is available and then adjustments will be made. Chair Sanders asked if taxpayers do not receive a statement prior to May 10, if they still need to submit the application prior to May 10. Ms. Land answered that late applications will be accepted if the tax payments are current and the program will be applied to the remaining balance of the amount due. Chair Sanders asked if the taxpayers who have previously taken advantage of the program will be notified. Ms. Land answered in the affirmative, and stated that letters go out to those individuals as signed contracts and have to be updated every year.

Mr. Rodman said that there will be a number of taxpayers who are accustomed to receiving a tax bill on May 10, but will not receive a bill this year by that time. He said that the Treasurer's Office will have press releases explaining why the bills are delayed. However, some people will come in to pay their bill without the notice and the Treasurer's Office will hopefully have the information in the system as to the amount that needs to be paid before May 10. Mr. Rodman said that he is hopeful that this same type of dilemma will not happen again next year.

Mr. Rodman said that there is also a Form 11, which shows the new assessed value, which should have been sent out to the taxpayers last year, but did not get sent out. He said that taxpayers need this information, as they have 30 days to appeal and file for tax abatements. Councillor Nytes said that she questions if it is allowable, as there are laws and state regulations determining when the notices are to be sent out. She said that she has many homeowners in her district that have built homes in areas that the City was striving to re-populate, so there were some abatement programs in some of those neighborhoods. Those individuals can find their abatement in jeopardy or be caused great confusion. She asked if anything can be done to rectify this problem. Mr. Rodman said that the Council has a right to ask for an explanation from the assessors.

Councillor Nytes asked which townships have not submitted their trending reports. Mr. Creasser answered that Washington Township's report was not in the correct format, Center Township is

still working on a part of their report, and Warren Township has not submitted their report. Councillor Nytes asked if the Council can obtain the proper language as it relates to requirement on the distribution of the Form 11. Ms. Land answered that the Treasurer's Office will look into obtaining that information for the Council.

Chair Sanders said that the Committee is appreciative that the Installment Tax Payment Program is made available to the taxpayers and she only regrets that taxpayers cannot be provided with all necessary information in a timely manner.

Councillor Nytes moved, seconded by Councillor Brown, to forward Proposal No. 90, 2007 to the full Council with a "Do Pass" recommendation. The motion carried by a vote of 5-0.

Information on the distribution of raises for the civilian employees of the City of Indianapolis –
Bob Clifford, City Controller

Chair Sanders said that in the 2007 budget, an allocation of certain monies was specified for all agencies to provide civilian employees, as well as non-bargaining unit employees with their first increase in a few years.

Mr. Clifford distributed the guidelines that were developed between the Department of Administration, Human Resources, and the Office of Finance and Management in conjunction with putting together the budget (attached as Exhibit D). He said that the guidelines were given to all the city departments and county agencies to consider. He said that 3% increases were built into the budget of all city and county agencies. Some exceptions to the guidelines included:

- Anyone hired after the announcement date, August 7, 2006, would not necessarily be eligible provided the employee is paid within the paygrade defined by Human Resources.
- Anyone who has received a promotion or equity pay increase after August 7, with the understanding that those circumstances essentially put the employee in a position of receiving a raise.
- Exception to non-bargaining unit guideline; money was included in the budget to issue raises for civilian employees of a new unit of the Indianapolis Police Department (IPD) and the Indianapolis Fire Department (IFD), ASCME, as they had gone three years without a raise.
- Employees must have been performing well. Essentially all city employees received 3% raises.
- Anyone who is already over the maximum pay for their paygrade, which mostly affected the county side.
- County Elected Officials did not receive raises, as those increases would have to go through ordinance changes and be approved by the Council.
- Probation Officers, Crime Lab, and Community Corrections did not receive raises, because those persons are paid under a state mandated pay plan.

Chair Sanders asked if the AFSCME unit was a newly formed bargaining unit who had not previously received any raises. Jeff Seidenstein, Budget Manager, Controller's Office, answered

in the affirmative and stated that those employees would have fallen into the non-bargaining unit employees. He stated that the AFSCME unit is only a portion of the civilian employees in IPD and IFD.

Mr. Clifford said that County Officials were given deference to the decision making process; therefore, those employees' raises were dependant upon the elected official. He said that some of the officials processed raises for their employees before leaving office and some did not. Chair Sanders asked how early before January 1 were the leaving officials allowed to make the adjustments. Mr. Seidenstein said that the newly elected officials have already turned in the requests for raises, but some are still working on them. He said that assessments of the staff are still being made to decide how to distribute the raises.

Mr. Clifford thanked the people in Payroll, the people that moved over from the Washington Township Fire Department, and the people of the Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department (IMPD) for processing and submitting all the changes by the end of the year.

Councillor Brown asked Mr. Clifford about raises for Correction Officers. Mr. Clifford said that Correction Officers are a part of a bargaining unit, and therefore, did not receive raises. Councillor Brown asked if anyone, not represented by a bargaining unit, received less than the 3% raise. Mr. Clifford answered that he is not aware of anyone in the City receiving less than 3%; however, county employees' raises were based upon the decision of the County elected official.

Councillor Plowman said that he has received correspondence from Correction Officers who were concerned about not receiving the raise, because they are a part of a bargaining unit, but were in the process of terminating their bargaining unit. The officers were concerned that they would not receive the raise. He asked if the Correction Officers are now negotiating their contract. Mr. Seidenstein said that he spoke with Allison Gritton, Corporation Counsel, who explained that the Correction Officers have made a request to the Sheriff to have the Indiana State FOP Council represent them. The Sheriff accepted the request in late January; therefore, negotiations will begin soon.

Mr. Clifford introduced Hope Tribble, Budget Manager, Office of Finance and Management. He said that she is currently assuming all the agencies that were previously handled by Kim Diller.

With no further business pending, and upon motion duly made, the Administration and Finance Committee of the City-County Council was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joanne Sanders, Chair
Administration and Finance Committee

JMS/nsm